REMARKS

Claims 1 to 33 are pending. The specification is amended. No new matter is added. Claims 1 to 33 stand rejected. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

The Office Action stated that Applicant needs to update page 1 of the specification by filling in the missing serial numbers. The specification has been updated.

§ 102 Rejections

Claims 1, 4, 8, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Karszes (US 6,060,003). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

"To anticipate, a single reference must teach each and every limitation of the claimed invention." Eolas Techs., Inc. v. Microsoft Corp., 399 F.3d 1325, 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2005); emphasis added. Independent claims 1 states:

> 1. A method of forming an optical film comprising:
> extruding a first material to form a first film in a molten state;
> extruding a second material to form a second film in a molten state;
> maintaining the first and second films in molten states;
> bringing the molten first film proximate the molten second film;
> patterning the molten second film to form a plurality of structures, the structures defining a plurality of cavities therebetween; and
> solidifying the molten second film. (emphasis added)

Karszes does not teach claim 1. In particular, nowhere does Karszes form a first film, form a second film, and bring the molten first film proximate the molten second film as recited in claim 1. Instead, Karszes discloses at column 3 line 67 through column 4 line 2:

> The resins contact one another in "black box" 122 and then flow through conduit 126 in die 128 and die opening 124. (Emphasis added)

Therefore, Karszes teaches extrusion of resins that are already in contact with one another.

Since Karszes fails to teach the steps of "extruding a first material to form a first film in a molten state", "extruding a second material to form a second film in a molten state", and "bringing the molten first film proximate the molten second film" as recited in claim 1, the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 4, 8, 10 and 12 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Karszes has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

§ 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 4, 8, 9 and 10-33 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karszes. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Office Action states that "it would have been obvious to have utilized a conventional coextrusion die as shown in the instant application in lieu of the black box and die of Karszes dependent on ability of flow desired through the die". Applicants respectfully disagree. Karszes provides no teaching or suggestion of extruding a first material to form a first film in a molten state. Karszes provides no teaching or suggestion of extruding a second material to form a second film in a molten state. Karszes provides no teaching or suggestion of maintaining the films in molten states. Furthermore, Karszes provides no teaching or suggestion of bringing the molten first film proximate the molten second film. Karszes teaches extrusion of resins that are already in contact with one another. It would not have been obvious to utilize a conventional coextrusion die in Karszes to arrive at Applicant's claim 1, because there would have been no motivation to do so. In particular, the Office has failed to show that even if a conventional coextrusion die could have been used in Karszes, why such a modification would have been obvious.

Since Karszes does not teach or suggest all the recitations of claim 1, the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 4, 8, 9, and 10-33 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karszes has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, and 5-7 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karszes in view of Fitzpatrick (US 4,701,019). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 2, 3, and 5-7 depend from independent claim 1. Claim 1 has been shown to be patentable over Karszes. Fitzpatrick fails to remedy any deficiencies in Karszes. In particular, Fitzpatrick provides no teaching or suggestion of extruding a first material to form a first film in a molten state. Fitzpatrick provides no teaching or suggestion of extruding a second material to form a second film in a molten state. Fitzpatrick provides no teaching or suggestion of maintaining the films in molten states. Furthermore, Fitzpatrick provides no teaching or suggestion of bringing the molten first film proximate the molten second film. For at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Karszes in view of Fitzpatrick. Claims 2, 3, and 5-7 depend from allowable claim 1, so claims 2, 3, and 5-7 are also allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of claims 2, 3, and 5-7 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karszes in view of Fitzpatrick, has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

In summary, the rejection of claims 1, 4, 8, 10 and 12 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Karszes, the rejection of claims 1, 4, 8, 9 and 10-33 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karszes, and the rejection of claims 2, 3, and 5-7 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karszes in view of Fitzpatrick have all been overcome and should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Examination and reconsideration of the application as amended is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

9/14/07
Date

By: _____
Robert V. Heiti, Reg. No.: 38,488
Telephone No.: 651-736-6360

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833